/889 cont./

caused principally by him. He ill-treated his wife, who was so offended that she refused to live with him, and took up her abode with her parents, who warmly took up her cause. He had also grieved his wife by other gross misconduct. There was accordingly a great disturbance, in which very many were concerned, and Tom Pust had his head badly wounded. He came to me to get it bound up, when I took the opportunity to reason with him. In his great rage against his wife (who is also a bad character) and her relatives he was blind to his own faults; he promised amendment. He said he would remain single" /cited in English/ (MM: IX, 191.1878).

The position of the run-away wife can become unpleasant if the relatives of her lawful husband are numerous and bold, for they naturally take his part.

/890/ The woman, also, though less frequently, may be the cause of dissolution of the marriage. If she is so uncommonly lazy and careless that the whole family suffers badly, the man is forced to look for another partner. To his chagrin, the wife nevertheless does not leave, and he can do nothing but drag her along whether he likes it or not. An incapacity to work because of illness or old age never leads to divorce, for the man is at liberty to take a young, healthy woman besides his first wife. An unbearable disposition which the woman may develop in the course of the years can torture a man to such an extent that he has no other recourse but to flee into the arms of another person. No one stops him. A general rule forbids a person to interfere in the marital affairs of relatives. It is only when a woman is mistreated that an uncle or some other relative will definitely take her part (101); the situation is different if she runs away.

101. Bridges (a):202 emphatically expressed this principle: "A father-in-law or brother-in-law does not take his daughter's or sister's part against her husband, unless he severely injures

/690 cont./ 586 [602]

her, when she is sometimes taken away from him and given to another" /cited in English/.

Young married couples sometimes separate after they have become better acquainted with each other and a definite antipathy has developed. This situation, of course, also may come about in the case of a couple who have shared the same hut for decades (102).

102. Bridges (a):184 mentions: "It frequently happens that there is inseparable aversion on the girl's part to her husband, and she leaves him, and if she persists in hating him she is then given to one she likes" /cited in English/.

586 837 Usually the real cause is an outside one, namely, a love affair with another person, which now presses toward a rupture of the existing marriage bond by any means available. Finally, in very exceptional cases, a man will get rid of a wife who has manifestly committed adultery (p. 468). In cases of adultery everyone is very lenient, for men, too, are by no means paragons of virtue in this respect.

586 It should be recognized that, although divorce among our Yamana is, to be sure, accomplished fairly easily, it is accompanied by significant secondary effects. It sounds ridiculous to maintain with Hyades (q):378: "Before the women become mothers, it is not rare to see them change husbands several times, either because of feminine inconstancy or because of bad treatment on the part of their spouses" /translated from French/ (103). Does anyone really believe

103. Apparently he simply repeats what Bridges (i):20 entered in his diary on April 22, 1871: "Not infrequently before they became settled in life, they have had many husbands, for the marriage relationship was not secure unless children were born to unite the parents in a common care for them" /cited in English/. I have already replied to this threadbare contention (pp. 408, 411).

that the appearance of the /691/ first child takes such a long time

/691 cont./

586 or that mistreatment of the woman begins immediately among young married couples? The circle of relatives of every married
586b person sees to it that a marriage continues, for they feel respon-
602 sible for his assured sustenance which is practically impossible or unsuitable outside of marriage, except in the case of elderly people. The woman who has been divorced through her own fault is, to begin with, a burden to her relatives, less because of her maintenance than because of the damaged reputation of the entire circle of relatives and because of the worry about her children. This explains why the relatives almost always try to settle a threatened relationship or to mend a broken marriage, even when the wife has been mistreated. The children are divided up according to the wish and intention of the spouses; either they remain with the mother if the man runs away, and vice versa, or some relatives take pity on the youngsters until the parents have returned to an ordered life.
[558] A person who through his own fault has dissolved a marriage never enjoys a good reputation.

586 These considerations have always tended to prevent light-hearted attempts at divorce. We do not have definite figures, but a man has more often run away from his wife than a woman from her husband; consideration for the children was a factor in this situation.

6. Celibacy

581 We have repeatedly pointed out that the economy of the Yamana basically prohibits a lifelong unmarried state, and that public opinion does not grant an individual full social standing unless he is married (104). Each of the two sexes has duties which can be

> 104. The Yamana find it incomprehensible, solely on the basis of the conduct of life, how Europeans can live unmarried for a lifetime and maintain themselves. They are regarded "as enigmas," as Hyades (q):377 expresses it.

fulfilled only through marriage. At marriageable age the young people are told in plain words that they may no longer put off a

1: Gusinde--600 E-S (1918-1924) 1937 5316 Yahgan' 5316

/777 cont./

C. Kinship and Tribal Society

182 Among peoples on the low cultural level of our Yamana it is easy to observe the close reciprocal relationship between the nature of the economy and the social order. No one will regard the one as caused solely by the other, nor may one summarily deny a certain inner connection between the two.

The total number of this Fuegian tribe is low, and there is nothing to indicate that it has been noticeably higher at any time during its long presence in the Cape Horn region (p. 227 /untranslated/). This fact alone permits only one interpretation, that a complex social order, according to the various points of view from which one judges and evaluates social structures, is not to be expected here, particularly since a compact social life in one place involving all the members of the tribe is completely lacking. What our natives acquire in the way of subsistence is certainly sufficient; they do not die of hunger, and can even eat their fill. An excess of any part of their limited assets, however, is impossible. They are dependent on an imperfect form of production; hence, they can neither become numerous nor unite in a compact social life. The population is limited, so to speak, by the available food supply, and since this is sparsely distributed over a wide area, a permanent association of all tribal members in one place or in a few specific places is impossible.

594 621 The entire tribe seems torn asunder into very small individual groups, each of whom lives widely separated from any of the others and enjoys complete independence. These groups cannot be subdivided into still lower units. They are the individual families. Each family, as such, forms an independent economic unit which is isolated as a distinct community and pursues its own goal in life. Lothrop (b):160 says briefly and definitely: "Yahgan society was based on the family. There was no higher unit" /cited in English/.

602 571 Closer and more remote degrees of kinship spread out around the individual family as around a point of crystallization, and the consciousness of belonging together is more pronounced the closer the blood tie is. The more distant the individual families are as kinsmen, the more tenuous their mutual relations. This /778/ is the basis for the limited association and wide dispersion of all

/778 cont./

•(62 571 [578] families within the same ethnic unit. Groups living far apart sometimes do not even know one another; their mutual estrangement is favorable soil for the growth of suspicion, mistrust, and animosity. Insecure and harsh economic conditions react on the social level in a centrifugal sense, if we may so express it (209).

209. Stirling, who has let some inaccuracies creep in, says: "Family life in Fuegia is exclusive. Get outside the family, and relationships are doubtful, if not hostile. The bond of a common language is no security for friendly offices. To be of the same tribe is no guarantee of safety in travelling. Fear and distrust are stronger than tribal affinities" /cited in English/ (MM:IV,11; 1870).

619 Nevertheless, there is a true tribal society on a modest scale. It is based on a common origin and language; it is expressed in the fact that everyone acts in exactly the same way and that all are subject to a definite, unwritten, universally binding law. Every individual feels that he is a member of the whole, he knows that he is united with one who can make himself intelligible to him in the same language, and he traces his origin to the same source as all others who are just as lawfully rooted in his native soil as he is. This consciousness becomes so strong that, as individuals and as a community, they are convinced that they form a special group; they believe themselves to be "the people," the ethnic unit having exclusive right of existence in their homeland. The boundaries of their homeland are regarded as something given in ancient times (210), whose legal validity is thus inviolably se-

210. Bridges (k):233 first learned of the homeland boundaries from the Yamana themselves.

cure for all time, no matter what the explanation for the original bounds of native territory and its first occupation by their forefathers.

1: Gumilla--G72 G-6 (1918-1934) 1927 SH6 Yahgan SH6

/778 cont./

619 554 Basically one tribal member is equal to every other socially and enjoys complete independence. All of them have about the same number of objects, little though this is, and there are no differences in property and economic pursuits which elsewhere sometimes cause very disparate social levels (211). In general,

> 211. This means, as Hyades (3):135 expresses himself: "There is no king, chieftain, aristocracy, caste, social hierarchy, or slaves; it is a regime of equality in the purest sense" /translated from French/.

therefore, every adult has the same rights within his tribe, and along with this they all have same duties. No one is specifically raised above the legal equality of the multitude by special privileges; they recognize neither one nor several headmen. One person or another may acquire a certain morally superior position within the narrow circle of relatives and acquaintances /779/ through richer experience after a long life and moral rectitude. His superiority, however, is solely a matter of personality and is neither precisely defined nor founded on objective legal norms.

[97] A division of the whole tribe into so-called dialect groups has occurred under the pressure of local conditions. It is purely external. The slight differences resulting from it are in line with the unavoidable pursuit of a livelihood by each independent group. The social order in which degrees of rank are unknown is just as simple as the economic structure (212).

> 212. The basic ideas of this section have already been published by Koppers (8):155.

a. Kinship

594 602 Yamana social organization rests on individual families (213).

> 213. Spegazzini (2):165 gives this fact in another form: "The family constitutes all their society" /translated from Spanish/.

/779 cont./

594
602

The interpretation which he adds is very mistaken: "And the man lives without pleasure, but also without great sorrow, among his wives and his children" /translated from Spanish/.

These families associate with each other more or less closely according to the closeness of their kinship ties. Consanguinity is the basis of kin-group unity, even though it spreads out in far-flung ramifications. Persons with the same blood form neither a strictly defined group nor a definite social stratum in a unique position with their own rights.

602 Among the closest relatives, however, certain obligations accrue out of their solidarity. These obligations are also part of the larger sphere of general social obligations, but they are more strongly emphasized for kinsmen. Conversely, the latter may count on special mutual aid as a sort of compensation. Kinsmen in the stricter sense of the word do not as such dispose of any kind of common property shared equally by all, nor are they guided by any unusual special regulations.

1. The Individual Family

594 In this context, as in other parts of the present book, the designation "individual family" always means only the small group made up of parents and children. Thus understood, the individual family is the kin group in the strictest sense of the word. Earlier travelers either failed to call attention to the family's natural and lawfully upheld position among the Yamana people as a whole or they only mentioned it. The navigators of earlier times recognized the occupants of one and the same canoe as a tightly knit group, but they were often mistaken in their judgment about individual persons, regarding as a man's wives two /780/ or more women who usually only by chance were in the same canoe with him. Subsequently it was chiefly the missionaries who opened their eyes to the actual independence and economic position of the individual family. Nevertheless, most travelers of the last few